REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barbara Hayes-Roth et al. (U.S. 2002-0005865 A1).

The claims are amended, and, thus, pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

An interview with the Examiner is requested to expedite prosecution.

The independent claims are 1, 15 and 16. The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Barbara Hayes-Roth paragraph 43 and newly relies upon paragraphs 386 and 389.

A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Hayes-Roth cannot be established, because Hayes-Roth FIG. 23 and paragraphs 386-389 fail to disclose either expressly, or inherently by failing to necessarily require, the language of claim 1 as follows:

Claim 1 require the limitation "a dialog agent control part that communicates with the dialog agents and the input part, and which intermediates between the plurality of dialog agents and the input part, *registers processing capability information indicating input information which each dialog agent is capable of accepting in each state* ... wherein, *each dialog agent notifies the dialog agent control part of the processing capability information of the dialog agent according to the state of the dialog agent* (emphasis added). Hayes-Roth fails to disclose expressly or inherently this feature of claim 1, because the language of claim 1 requires that each dialog agent decide processing capability information according to the state of the dialog agent and notify the dialog agent control part of the processing capability, whereas in Hayes-Roth the agent engine 14 decides a capability processing by matching the actual context with the potential context of the dialog agent, namely Hayes-Roth Abstract and paragraphs 388-389 discuss "The run-time agent uses the content to control behavior of the agent in an actual context that matches the potential context."

The Office Action also relies upon Hayes-Roth paragraph 389 and FIG. 23, which discusses 'agent engine 14 retrieves content based on current values of the state variables and uses the retrieved content to control agent behavior 22.' In other words, Hayes-Roth paragraphs 43 and 386-389 discuss the agent engine 14 determining whether an actual state variable in the given actual context matches a corresponding state variable in the given potential context, but

fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently (by failing to necessarily require), that each of a plurality of dialog agents notify a dialog agent controller, as an intermediary of the plurality of dialog agents, about the dialog agent's processing capability in relation to the state of each dialog agent, namely the claimed "***each dialog agent notifies the dialog agent control part of the processing capability information of the dialog agent according to the state of the dialog agent***" and the dialog agent control part "***registers processing capability information indicating input information which each dialog agent is capable of accepting in each state*** by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents" (emphasis added). In other words, Hayes-Roth is silent on a dialog agent notifying processing capability information to a dialog agent controller.

The Office Action also relies upon Hayes-Roth paragraph 386, which discusses 'delivery of a message by the agent, including messages about pervious user input or agent capability,' however, this relates to an internal event of an agent. It is readily apparent that in Hayes-Roth FIG. 23, the agent engine 14 does not expressly or inherently notify a dialog agent control part about processing capability information of the dialog agent. In addition, claim 1 is amended and it is readily apparent that Hayes-Roth FIG. 23 and paragraphs 386-389 fail to disclose either expressly or inherently the language of amended claim 1, namely "***a dialog agent control part ... provides a current context agent estimating part that stores information regarding a current context agent that has finally performed a dialog with a user***" and "***if according to the notified capability information the current context agent is capable of accepting the input information,*** the dialog agent control part selects ~~a dialog~~the current context agent and transmits the input information to the current context agent to receive a response thereto, and ***if according to the notified capability information the current context agent is not capable of accepting the input information,*** the dialog agent control part selects a dialog agent that is not the current context agent and is capable of accepting the input information ~~based upon the~~ ~~registered processing capability information of each dialog agent in each state,~~ and transmits the input information to the selected dialog agent to receive a response thereto."

In addition, no evidence has been found, either expressly or inherently, that Hayes-Roth agent engine 14 in FIG. 23 under a broadest reasonable interpretation can meet the claimed "***dialog agent control part***" in relation to the claimed "***dialog agents ... each dialog agent notifies the dialog agent control part of the processing capability information of the dialog agent according to the state of the dialog agent***" and where the ***dialog agent control***

8

*part provides "**a current context agent estimating part that stores information regarding a current context agent that has finally performed a dialog with a user**" and "**if according to the notified capability information the current context agent is capable of accepting the input information,** the dialog agent control part selects a dialogthe current context agent and transmits the input information to the current context agent to receive a response thereto, and **if according to the notified capability information the current context agent is not capable of accepting the input information**, the dialog agent control part selects a dialog agent that is not the current context agent and is capable of accepting the input information based upon the registered processing capability information of each dialog agent in each state, and transmits the input information to the selected dialog agent to receive a response thereto."*

An interview with the Examiner is requested to expedite prosecution, should the anticipation rejection over Hayes-Roth be maintained. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 15 and 16 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 1. The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____October 26, 2009_____   By: _____

Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501s